

# **SCAAC Meeting Minutes**

**(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)**

September 10, 2001  
State Board Room  
Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky

**Committee Members:**

Jamie Bowling	Benny Lile, Chairman	Robert Sexton
Dale Campbell	Gary Meilcarek	Linda Sheffield, Ph.D.
Kay Freeland	Eleanor Mills	Dr. H. M. Snodgrass
Suzanne Guyer	Henry Ormsby	Roxie R. Tempus
Varetta D. Hurt	Roger Pankratz	J. Maynard Thomas, V. Chairman

## **SCAAC Agenda**

	<b>Agenda Items</b>	<b>Presenters</b>
	<b>Call to Order</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Roll Call</b>	<b>Roger Ervin</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Approval of Minutes from May 21, 2001 Meeting</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Extending Regulatory Timelines for Reconfigured Schools</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Student Performance Standard Training</b>	<b>Starr Lewis</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Overview of the Core Content for Assessment</b>	<b>Starr Lewis</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Overview of the Minority Task Force Pilot Districts</b>	<b>Bernard Hamilton</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Review of National Student Accountability Practices</b>	<b>Ivan Zabilka</b>
<b>Adjournment</b>		

**Call to Order****Benny Lile**

Chairperson Benny Lile called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. EDT.

**1. Roll Call****Roger Ervin**

The membership roll was called with the following members present:

Dale Campbell  
Kay Freeland  
Suzanne Guyer  
Varetta D. Hunt

Benny Lile  
Henry Ormsby  
Roger Pankratz  
Linda Sheffield

Dr. H. M. Snodgrass  
Roxie R. Tempus  
Maynard Thomas

**Presenters:**

Bernard Hamilton, Office of Supportive Learning Environments, Kentucky Department of Education

Starr Lewis, Office of Academic and Professional Development, Kentucky Department of Education

Benny Barrowman, Region 5 Service Center, Kentucky Department of Education

Marcia Lile, Division of Curriculum, Kentucky Department of Education

Ivan Zabilka, Division of Validation and Research, Kentucky Department of Education

**In Attendance:**

Kentucky Department of Education: Roger Ervin, Brenda Withrow

Kentucky Education Association (KEA): Sharon Felty Comer

Legislative Research Commission, Office of Education Accountability: Gerald Lunney

## **2. Approval of Minutes from May 21, 2001 Meeting**

**Benny Lile**

A question was raised about the correctness of the August 7 date on Page 7, item 5, on line 2. After a brief discussion the date was not changed. Varetta Hurt asked that her name be spelled correctly on page 1. With this one correction, there was a motion and a second to approve the minutes. The motion passed without dissent.

Benny Lile indicated the need to elect a new chair and vice chair. He suggested that members come prepared to vote at the next meeting when the final two appointments would be made. After discussion, which indicated that the new members would not know how to vote, and that the SCAAC was receiving excellent leadership from the incumbents, Suzanne Guyer moved, and Roger Pankratz seconded that Benny Lile and Maynard Thomas be reelected as chair and vice chair respectively. The motion passed without dissent.

Benny Lile indicated that no action has been forthcoming on the appointment of a school board representative, and a DAC to the SCAAC, but that he expected them to be in place by the next meeting. Mr. Lile also indicated that he had asked Senator Ford to come to revisit the charge to this committee.

Dates were set for future meetings: November 12, 2001, January 14, 2002, and March 11, 2001.

All meetings are to begin at 9:00 am. At the end of the day there was a brief discussion of the fact that November 12 was a holiday. No member present indicated that they would be unable to attend because of the holiday; however, there was not a quorum present at that time.

Mr. Lile requested information concerning Roger Ervin, and Dr. Ivan Zabilka updated the committee on Roger's condition.

Mr. Lile reviewed the agenda, indicating that there would have to be some adjustments due to Dr. Bernard Hamilton's presence at 10:00 am. He also reported briefly that the legislative hearings on student accountability went well, with the hearing officers moving from support of student accountability toward advocating more money of early intervention, based upon testimony by the high schools.

### **3. Extending Regulatory Timelines for Reconfigured Schools**

**Benny Lile**

The new growth charts are fixed from now until 2014. Reconfigured schools according to regulation are to use the district index to establish their base line. There is provision for districts to submit a plan for establishing a growth chart, but the September 30 deadline creates problems for schools that find out about reconfiguration at the last minute in response to population shifts.

Mr. Lile read the four alternative resolutions to the problem in the staff note presented to the Board of Education. There were some expressions in support of reopening the regulation on the part of the SCAAC members. They expressed concern over fairness, and the justice of the school wishing to establish its own baseline. Concern was expressed over the possibility of a school going a lengthy time without its own baseline if there should be multiple reconfigurations in a rapidly changing county. There was some concern over the lack of information, with

Dr. Pankratz recommending that the committee receives more information. There was discussion of basing the reconfigured school's baseline on the previous performance of the current students, with the necessity of gathering that data from a potential multiplicity of sites.

After the extensive discussion and the recognition that they were perhaps getting into details of regulation writing, the committee reached a consensus that a reconfigured school should have the opportunity to establish its own baseline, and should use the district baseline only until the school's can be established. This was moved by Henry Ormsby, seconded by Varetta Hurt with the further condition that criteria and timelines were to be set by the Board of Education. The motion passed without dissent.

The committee requested an explanation of rewards.

### **4. Student Performance Standard Training**

**Starr Lewis**

Starr Lewis, Associate Commissioner, OAPD introduced the program that has been developed to train teachers in the use of the new performance descriptions. She indicated that a key concern was how to use the new standards in conjunction with the effort to individualize instruction to meet student needs. One of the primary objectives of the new descriptions is to demonstrate what proficiency looks like, which must be done with student work along side the descriptions. The performance standards are much more detailed than they have been in the past. She briefly described the work of the Cross Agency Proficiency Team.

Marcia Lile, Social Studies Consultant, described the two day training sessions, which will be presented approximately ten times in each region. Schools are being invited to send three representatives, including the principal if possible, who will then train the teachers in their school using the same materials with which they practice. The first module of the training is devoted to an explanation of the process of setting of the new standards. The power point that SCAAC has seen is a focal part of that module.

Module two, which stretches over the afternoon of day one and the morning of day two, is devoted to combining the descriptions with benchmark papers written by students. This process enables the participants to see apprentice and proficient work, and to establish the difference between the two levels. Then they also have the opportunity to discuss what steps must be taken with the apprentice work to raise it to proficient. The focus is upon what must change in the instructional process. The participants also evaluate the level of yet other papers to internalize the standards. Module 2 focuses on a total of four significant exercises for the participants.

Module three then allows the school team to focus, with guidance, upon the next steps that must be taken to implement the new standards in their schools. During the training the emphasis is upon the differences between the apprentice and proficient levels. Among the tools are assembled books of student work. The focus upon social studies resulted from the difficulty that many social studies teachers are having in figuring what to do. At various stages of the training there are some prompting questions that require reflection.

All the training materials will be available on the website on or about September 14, 2001. The availability of the materials will enable teachers to work with parents to understand the new standards.

Dale Campbell indicated some concern over the timing of training at this busy portion of the year, as opposed to before school started. Marcia Lile and Starr Lewis' response focused on the necessity of having the standards approved by the Board of Education, and the development time for the training as the reasons for the training coming after the start of the school year. Linda Sheffield and Roger Pankratz questioned why the college and university personnel involved with pre-service and in-service instruction were not invited. The issue was one of space, but Starr Lewis agreed that universities would be notified of any open spaces.

Dr. Pankratz expressed concern over the use of data, and the role of universities in assisting with interpretation. Starr Lewis mentioned Susan Weston's guide to the CATS data.

The Evaluator's Edition of the KPR will be on the web after scores are released. Roxie Tempus expressed concern over the parents being left out of the training. Marcia Lile indicated that the intention was that they be included when training is given at the schools. Parents were left out of the first round of training because of the sheer number

of school personnel that needed to be trained. Ms. Tempus reiterated that parents should be included in the first round. Dale Campbell indicated that the data was comprehensible, but the difficulty was getting teachers to buy-in to the idea that they could do something about it. Starr Lewis raised the difficulties in tracking student progress across years. Then, several members raised concerns over the statewide perception that standards have been lowered. In response, Marcia Lile used PL/VS as an example. When the first cut points were set there was no Core Content, PL/VS questions were imbedded in other subjects, and two of the three methods used in the current process had not been invented yet. The new standards are for a new test, using the best methods, by one of the largest numbers of teachers ever used for standard setting.

## **5. Overview of the Core Content for Assessment**

**Starr Lewis**

By agreement this agenda item was carried over to the next meeting, but Starr Lewis indicated that materials would be forwarded to the members. In preparation she raised two questions to be considered. (1) How can we refocus the attention of teachers on the Program of Studies, when the Core Content has usurped the focus because of testing? A subordinate issue to this is how to deal more effectively with the transition to college. The P-16 issues and recommendations are addressed in the Program of Studies, but not in the Core Curriculum. (2) How can we get more focused on the individual student and his/her progress through the system? KELP addresses this to some extent at the elementary level, and the Individual Program of Studies does some of this at the high school level, but are these enough? The search is for a non-bureaucratic, non-cumbersome solution. Dr. Sheffield indicated that Northern Kentucky University had been successfully using charts with the Program of Studies topics at grade level in a column, with additional columns for teachers to record dates on which the topics are addressed in class.

## **6. Overview of the Minority Task Force Pilot Districts**

**Bernard Hamilton**

Dr. Bernard Hamilton spoke concerning the seven districts, which enroll 73% of Kentucky African American students, and which are working on the ten goals established by the Minority Student Achievement Taskforce. He distributed a summary history of the Taskforce, and the summary district plans. The current effort is focused on defining objectives, and indicating appropriate methods of measuring progress. AEL is also aiding in the measurement process. A network connecting the districts has been created through the technology center.

The districts have chosen their own goals, stated their initiatives, and aligned these goals with the Standards and Indicators. Dr. Pankratz asked if equity was being interpreted to mean that all children are treated the same (as in detracking) or whether equity meant that children would be treated differently in terms of teaching methodology (as in differentiated instruction). Maynard Thomas questioned Dr. Hamilton closely about what efforts are being made to recruit minority teachers. Mr. Thomas also indicated that we are not effectively dealing with racism in the hiring processes at the district level. Varetta Hurt indicated that hiring decisions in the hands of SBDM Councils prevented superintendents from offering minority teachers contracts on the spot, which recruiters from other states are doing. It was advocated that all minorities need role models including the disabled.

Greg Figg is the pilot district contact person. The intention was for him to address the SCAAC in the afternoon, but he was unavailable. Dr. Hamilton closed with a statement of optimism about the attitude and culture in the pilot districts and schools. He indicated that three universities (University of Kentucky, University of Louisville, and Western Kentucky University) are working with the pilot districts. Mr. Thomas requested that students be invited to share concerning changes they have seen in their schools as a result of the project. Dr. Hamilton indicated willingness to arrange that.

## **7. Review of National Student Accountability Practices**

**Ivan Zabilka**

Dr. Ivan Zabilka gave a brief summary of eleven issues that have been prominently raised regarding gateway tests or high school graduation tests. The committee requested that this summary be circulated to the committee before the next meeting.

### **Next Meeting**

Commonwealth Accountability Testing System state and regional disaggregated results. The committee requested that the results be sent to the non-school members of the committee as soon as available so they can review the data closely.

The following are items to be covered in the next meeting.

1. Core Content Review;
2. Address Starr Lewis' two questions;
3. Minority Student Pilot Projects;
4. Request that Greg Figg present a summary of the progress of the pilot districts;
5. Update on decisions about Extending Regulatory Timelines; and
6. Update on Federal Actions, especially any information about the possibility of Kentucky receiving an exemption from the 3 – 8 every year testing.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 pm.